



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/706,366	11/12/2003	Hideaki Tsuda	1508.68727	6792
7590	01/24/2006		EXAMINER	
Patrick G. Burns, Esq. GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD. Suite 2500 300 South Wacker Dr. Chicago, IL 60606			NGUYEN, THANH NHAN P	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2871	
DATE MAILED: 01/24/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/706,366	TSUDA, HIDEAKI
	Examiner (Nancy) Thanh-Nhan P. Nguyen	Art Unit 2871

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 January 2006.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-8 and 10-16 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-8 and 10-16 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 12 November 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to Amendment After Final dated 1/6/2006.
2. Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive with the verified English translation of Japanese priority document number 2002-345543 provided, and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2, and 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arakawa et al U.S. Patent No. 6,621,550 in view of Yamada et al U.S. Reissued Patent No. RE38,288 and Grupp et al U.S. Patent No. 6,449,028.

Regarding claims 1, Arakawa et al discloses a liquid crystal display panel, wherein the liquid crystal shows a nematic phase at an ordinary temperature and a dielectric anisotropy of the liquid crystal is negative, [see col. 2, lines 15-19].

Arakawa et al lacks disclosure of a liquid crystal display panel in which a liquid crystal into which an alignment control agent is added is filled between a

pair of substrates and an alignment regulate layer is formed on liquid crystal side surfaces of the pair of substrates respectively by causing the alignment control agent to adhere thereon.

Yamada et al discloses a liquid crystal display panel in which a liquid crystal into which an alignment control agent is added is filled between a pair of substrates and an alignment regulate layer is formed on liquid crystal side surfaces of the pair of substrates respectively by causing the alignment control agent to adhere thereon, [see fig. 1; col. 9, lines 13-15, 41-62], for the benefit of improving viewing angle characteristics and display quality, [see col. 6, lines 7-9]. Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have an alignment control agent added to liquid crystal material between a pair of substrates and an alignment regulate layer is formed on the surfaces of the pair of substrates respectively by causing the alignment control agent to adhere thereon for the benefit of improving viewing angle characteristics and display quality.

Arakawa et al further lacks disclosure of wherein the alignment regulate layer has a regulation power for aligning the molecules of the liquid crystal vertically to the substrate surface.

Grupp et al discloses the alignment regulate layer ('8' -- polymer wall) has a regulation power for aligning the molecules of the liquid crystal vertically to the substrate surface, [fig. 2], for the benefit of obtaining a more reliable display with better contrast and without halos or parasite display points, [col. 2, lines 45-51]. Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a

person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the device Arakawa in view of Yamada and further with Grupp's polymer wall as the alignment regulate layer for aligning the molecules of the liquid crystal vertically to the substrate surface for the benefit of obtaining a more reliable display with better contrast and without halos or parasite display points.

Regarding claim 2, Arakawa et al discloses a nematic liquid crystal composition having a value of dielectric anisotropy $\Delta\epsilon$ within the range of -2 to -10, [col. 2, lines 15-19]. It has been judicially determined that overlapping ranges are at least obvious, [see MPEP 2144.05]. The range of the dielectric anisotropy of the liquid crystal is $\Delta\epsilon < -3$ would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. Further, when the dielectric anisotropy is increased in the negative direction, driving at a voltage of as low as 5V or less becomes possible, [see col. 8, lines 3-6].

Claims 4 and 6 are met the discussion regarding claim 1 rejection above.

Claim 5 is met the discussion regarding claim 3 rejection above.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arakawa et al in view of Yamada et al and Grupp et al as discussed above, and further in view of Nam et al U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0039160.

Regarding claim 3, Arakawa et al lacks disclosure of acrylate monomer is used as the alignment control agent.

Nam et al discloses acrylate monomer is used as the alignment control agent for the benefit of increasing the cross linking index of the alignment film,

[see par. 0048, and 0050]. Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use acrylate monomer as the alignment control agent for the benefit of increasing the cross linking index of the alignment film.

Claims 7 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arakawa et al in view of Yamada et al and Grupp et al as discussed above, and further in view of Shibahara U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0008836.

Regarding claims 7 and 10, Arakawa et al lacks disclosure of the column-like spacers for maintaining an interval between the pair of substrates constant are arranged in areas between subpixels; wherein the column-like spacers are formed at a rate of one spacer to plural pixels.

Shibahara discloses the column-like spacers for maintaining an interval between the pair of substrates constant are arranged in areas between subpixels; wherein the column-like spacers are formed at a rate of one spacer to plural pixels, [see figs. 1 and 4], for the benefit of having the spacing between the spacers widened; causing the substrates to flex so as to track a dimensional change in the gap that accompanies a temperature change in the liquid crystal between the substrates, [see par. 0032]. Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have column-like spacers formed at a rate of one spacer to plural pixels for the benefit of having the spacing between the spacers widened; causing the substrates to

flex so as to track a dimensional change in the gap that accompanies a temperature change in the liquid crystal between the substrates.

Claims 8, 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arakawa et al in view of Yamada et al, Grupp et al and Shibahara as discussed above, and further in view of Sawasaki et al U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0026347.

Regarding claim 8, Arakawa lacks disclosure of the column-like spacers are formed by exposing and developing a photoresist.

Sawasaki et al discloses the spacers (25a) are formed by exposing and developing a photoresist (25) for the benefit of being able to have a uniform height and being possible to be arranged at predetermined positions, thus maintaining the cell gap constant over the entire display region and therefore improving the display quality, [see par. 0113]. Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have the column-like spacers are formed by exposing and developing a photoresist for the benefit of being able to have a uniform height and being possible to be arranged at predetermined positions, thus maintaining the cell gap constant over the entire display region and therefore improving the display quality.

Claim 11 is met the discussion regarding claim 8 rejection above.

Claim 12 is met the discussion regarding claims 11 and 3 rejection above.

Claims 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arakawa et al in view of Yamada et al and Grupp et al as

discussed above, and further in view of Yamada et al U.S. Patent No. 5,729,318.

Regarding claim 13, Arakawa lacks disclosure of the liquid crystal contains a liquid crystal composition that includes fluorine.

Yamada et al discloses the liquid crystal contains a liquid crystal composition that includes fluorine for the benefit of having great characteristic such as excellent in chemical reaction resistance for the photopolymerization effect, [see col. 29, lines 45-50]. Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have discloses the liquid crystal contains a liquid crystal composition that includes fluorine for the benefit of having great characteristic such as excellent in chemical reaction resistance for the photopolymerization effect.

Claim 14 is met the discussion regarding claims 4 and 13 rejection above.

Claim 15 is met the discussion regarding claims 7 and 13 rejection above.

Claim 16 is met the discussion regarding claims 11 and 13 rejection above.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-8 & 10-16 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.**

See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to (Nancy) Thanh-Nhan P. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-1673. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F/9-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Kim can be reached on 571-272-2293. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

(Nancy) Thanh-Nhan P Nguyen
Examiner
Art Unit 2871
-- January 18, 2006 --

TN

Andrew Schechter
ANDREW SCHECHTER
PRIMARY EXAMINER